

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 2, 4-10, 12-15, 17-23 and 25-27 were pending in the above-identified application.

Claims 4, 5, 17 and 18 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Claims 2, 4-7, 10, 12, 15, 17-20, 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rowe et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,008,803 (hereinafter "Rowe").

Claims 8, 9, 13, 14, 21, 22, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe in view of Young U.S. Patent No. 5,727,060 (hereinafter "Young").

II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended claims 2 and 15 to more particularly define the claimed invention. Applicants have also amended claims 4, 5, 17 and 18 to correct informalities. Applicants have further canceled claims 10, 12-14, 23 and 25-27 without prejudice. No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the originally-filed specification (see, e.g., applicants' specification at FIG. 29 and col. 12, line 49 to col. 13, line 7). The Examiner's objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

III. Summary of Telephonic Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the January 25, 2006 telephonic interview with the undersigned. During the

interview, the differences between applicants' invention and the cited reference, Rowe, were discussed. In particular, the undersigned discussed the location of the navigation cell within the program grid as shown in FIG. 29 of applicants' specification, which is in contrast to the separate category, subcategory, and program displays as shown in FIGS. 2-6 of Rowe. The Examiner acknowledged a difference between applicants' invention and Rowe, but indicated that such difference was not reflected in the claims. However, the Examiner indicated that if applicants were to amend the independent claims to more clearly reflect the program grid as shown in FIG. 29 of applicants' specification, such an amendment would overcome the rejection under Rowe. Accordingly, applicants agreed to amend the independent claims to more clearly distinguish applicants' claimed invention over Rowe.

IV. Applicants' Reply to the Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 4, 5, 17 and 18 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. In particular, claims 4, 5, 17 and 18 were objected to because of informalities in the claim dependencies. Applicants have amended claims 4, 5, 17 and 18 to correct the claim dependencies.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the objections to these claims be withdrawn.

V. Applicants' Reply to the Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4-7, 15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rowe. Claims 8, 9, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe in view

of Young. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' invention, as defined by amended independent claims 2 and 15, is directed to a method and system for navigating in a program guide. A program guide is presented to the user. The program guide includes a time bar divided into a plurality of horizontally arranged time cells, a channel bar divided into a plurality of vertically arranged channel cells, and a program grid having a plurality of cells arranged in rows and columns. Each of the cells in the program grid is associated with one of the channel cells and at least one of the time cells. At least one of the cells in the program grid corresponds to a navigation cell that may be selected by the user. The navigation cell is a cell within the program grid that includes at least one navigation point. A navigation point corresponds to menu shortcut choices that may provide a user with shortcuts for navigating within the program guide. The remainder of the cells in the program grid corresponds to program information cells. In response to a user selection of the navigation cell, the program guide navigates to the navigation point. (See, e.g., applicants' specification at FIG. 29 and col. 12, line 49 to col. 13, line 7)

Contrary to the Examiner's contentions, applicants respectfully submit that Rowe does not show or suggest the program guide having a time bar, a channel bar, and a program grid including program information cells and at least one navigation cell as defined in applicants' amended independent claims 2 and 15.

Rowe generally describes a programming guide system. As shown and described in connection with FIGS. 2-6, a schedule display 50 presents program scheduling information via a schedule display 50 having three

display elements: a category display 52, a subcategory display 54, and a program display 56. The category display 52 includes categories of programming information (e.g., shopping, special, sports, talk shows, comedies), the subcategory display 54 includes subcategories of programming information (e.g., auto racing, baseball, basketball, bowling, football) associated with a selected category (e.g., sports), and the program display 56 includes program items associated with the selected subcategory. The program display 56 presents program-specific information including program title, program start-time, and program channel. (Rowe, FIGS. 2-6; col. 2, lines 55-67; col. 7, line 17 to col. 8, line 35).

In Rowe, the category display, the subcategory display, and the program display are in separate, adjacent displays. The program display (1) includes only program-specific information and (2) is the only display that has time and channel information associated with it. This is in contrast to applicants' independent claims 2 and 15, which recite that the program guide includes:

a time bar divided into a plurality of horizontally arranged time cells, a channel bar divided into a plurality of vertically arranged channel cells, and a program grid having a plurality of cells arranged in rows and columns, each of the cells being associated with one of the channel cells and at least one of the time cells, wherein at least one of the cells in the program grid corresponds to a navigation cell ... and a remainder of the cells in the program grid corresponds to program information cells...

(emphasis added).

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 2 and 15 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 4-9, which depend from independent claim 2, and claims 17-22, which depend from independent claim 15, are therefore also in condition for allowance.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 2, 4-9, 15 and 17-22, is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Evelyn C. Mak  
Evelyn C. Mak  
Registration No. 50,492  
Attorney for Applicants  
Fish & Neave IP Group  
Ropes & Gray LLP  
Customer No. 1473  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020-1105  
(212) 596-9000